

and swamps where the birds breed, render the enforcement of such a law, even if it really existed, simply impossible.

The pamphlet deals also with the reckless destruction of Humming-birds, Goura Pigeons, Himalayan Pheasants, Paradise Birds, Lyre Birds, Storks, Pelicans, Grebes, etc., and exposes the false assertions of the feather dealers regarding the limited extent and slight importance of the feather trade in diminishing the numbers of any of these species.

The subject of the prohibition of the importation of plumage and of international laws to prevent it, is also presented at length. The paper has thus a broad scope, and is especially important in its analysis of the feather trade defense. It is a strong document that should have the widest possible circulation.

Another recent brochure dealing with misleading statements of New York milliners engaged in the Heron plume traffic is entitled 'Confessions of a Plume Hunter,' and forms Special Leaflet No. 23 of the National Association of Audubon Societies. It is in the form of a sworn statement, addressed to the Secretary of the Association, by Mr. A. H. Meyer, formerly in business as a plume collector in Venezuela and Colombia for twelve years (1896-1905, inclusive). After citing the fact that certain commercial interests in New York City are circulating stories "to the effect that the aigrettes used in the millinery trade come chiefly from Venezuela, where they are gathered from the ground in the large garzeros or breeding colonies of white herons," he goes on to state, from his own personal knowledge, that "It is the custom in Venezuela to shoot the birds while the young are in the nests," and that after the breeding season the plumes are virtually of no commercial value, "because of the worn and frayed condition to which they have been reduced." A few of the plumes of the large white herons are picked up about their breeding places, but they are of small value and are known as 'dead feathers.'

The impossible stories circulated by the millinery interest in New York are stated to be based on a letter written by "Mayeul Grisol, Naturalist and Explorer of the Honorary Mission of the Museum of Natural History in Paris." The absurdity of these statements led Prof. Henry Fairfield Osborn, President of the American Museum of Natural History in New York, to cable an inquiry to the Paris Museum of Natural History regarding Mayeul Grisol. The reply, dated April 22, 1911, was: "Mayeul Grisol inconnu" — J. A. A.

Boas on Rooks and on Damage done by them in Denmark.¹— The writer treats his subject under the following headings: Food of Rooks; Rooks useful or injurious? How shall we estimate the economic significance of Rooks? Distribution of Rooks in Denmark; Experience with injury by Rooks in Denmark; Summary of damage; Comparison of injuries and benefits; Means against Rooks, and Legislation against Rooks.

¹ Boas, J. E. V. Raagerne og raageskade i Danmark. Tidssk. f. Landbrugets Planteavl. XVIII, 1911. Separately paged [1-29], 1 map.

The first three headings cover a discussion of articles on Rooks by Gilmour, Rörig, Schleh, and Hollrung, in which the results of stomach examinations are set forth and commented upon. The distribution of Rooks in Denmark is considered in detail and is illustrated by a map which shows the location of breeding colonies, and also localities where Rooks are definitely reported not to breed. It appears that Rooks are confined to the eastern part of the kingdom.

Seven pages are taken up with the reproduction of letters giving experience with injuries by the Rooks. This testimony is then summarized. The principal damage seems to be to seed grain, potatoes, and turnips. Grain is pilfered from shocks as well as from newly planted fields, and both seed potatoes and the young tubers are dug out and devoured. Although Rooks visit patches of young turnip plants in search of insect larvæ they do more harm than good by trampling down and killing the tender seedlings. The birds do minor damage by scratching manure away from plants, by general depredations in out-lying gardens, by stealing cherries, robbing partridge nests, and digging up seeds in forest nurseries.

The author's conclusion is that the Rook is an important injurious species, responsible for an annual loss to the agriculturists of Denmark, which must be reckoned in hundreds of thousands of crowns (crown = 26.8 cents). Some individuals lose thousands of crowns but the loss falls mainly upon the small holders. It is evident, he says, that the Rook is a bird which we must combat.

Among methods of fighting Rooks those recommended as most effective are taking the eggs and young from the nests, and felling trees containing nesting colonies. Shooting through the nests in the evening after the birds have gone to roost also is advised, and the author naively remarks that this is particularly disagreeable to the Rooks. The adults leave and the young die.

The article closes with a section on legislation against Rooks and a bibliography of 17 titles.—W. L. M.

Huntington's 'Our Wild Fowl and Waders.'¹—It is apparent to all who have given much thought to the matter, that there can be but one ultimate result of the time-worn American system of protecting game only by restrictive legislation, and that result is extermination of the game. Of what avail is it to shorten the season or to reduce the bag limit, when the number of hunters greatly increases every year? Manufacturers of guns and ammunitions expend fortunes in extending their business, but they as well as the gunners themselves must be made to realize that there is a limit to the increase of hunting. If they push blindly forward to that limit, both business and sport, insofar as they depend on the existence of game birds, will vanish.

¹ Huntington, D. W. *Our Wild Fowl and Waders*. Amateur Sportsman Co., New York. Dec., 1910. 207 pp.